UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. CR 17-389 RS
Plaintiff, v.) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING) TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TOTAL ACT)
Dray Mosky Defendant. For the reasons stated by the parties on the time under the Speedy Trial Act from finds that the ends of justice served by the	JUL 0 2 2018 SUSAN Y. SOONG OCLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT OF CALLIFORNIA Trecord on July 2, 2018, the Court excludes 14 2, 2018 to July 3, 2018 and continuance outweigh the best interest of the public
finding and bases this continuance on the f	U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this following factor(s):
Failure to grant a continuan See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	ce would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
number of defendants, the na novel questions of fact or law, that is	the complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the ture of the prosecution, or the existence of t is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for f within the time limits established by this section. See
	ce would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain he exercise of due diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. §
Failure to grant a continuan of counsel, given counsel's other scl exercise of due diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.	ce would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity heduled case commitments, taking into account the .S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	ce would unreasonably deny the defendant the ive preparation, taking into account the exercise of due (7)(B)(iv).
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: 7-2-18 STIPULATED:	SALLIE KIM United States Magistrate Judge
Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney